

REMARKS

This paper is submitted in response to the Office Action dated March 21, 2007. In addition, Applicant respectfully requests that a one-month extension of time be granted to respond to the Office Action mailed March 21, 2007, and that the Examiner consider this a petition therefor. The period of response therefore extends up to and includes July 23, 2007 (since July 21, 2007 is a Saturday), and this paper is timely filed. Authorization for a Credit Card charge of \$120.00 for the one-month extension fee is hereby included in the Electronic Fee Sheet attached. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims by the Examiner are therefore respectfully requested.

In the subject Office Action, claims 1-32 and 34-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,094,688 to Mellen-Garnett et al. In addition, claims 1, 16, 19, 34 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by "Business process integration with IBM CrossWorlds, Part 1: Introduction to collaboration development" to Cutlip, published in May 2002 (Cutlip). Furthermore, claim 33 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mellen-Garnett in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,574,917 to Good et al.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections to the extent that they are maintained. Applicant has canceled claims 2-3, 11, 16-18, 20-21, 28 and 33-38 and amended claims 1 and 19. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is being added by the above amendments, as the amendments are fully supported in the specification, drawings and claims as originally filed. Applicants also note that the amendments made herein are being made only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the aforementioned claimed subject matter. Applicants are not conceding in this application that the originally-claimed subject matter is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, and Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue this and other subject matter in one or more continuation and/or divisional patent applications.

As an initial matter, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the consideration extended in the telephonic interview conducted between the Examiner and Applicant's representative on June 28, 2007. In the interview, proposed amendments to the claims to

address the Section 102 rejections were discussed. In addition, the Examiner suggested that the concept of using a wildcarded field in a mapping, as recited in claim 33, would be favorably considered.

Now turning to the subject Office Action and specifically with regard to the Examiner's rejection of independent claim 1, this claim as amended recites a method of managing a plurality of software development environments coupled to one another through a cross development environment. The method comprises the following steps:

- receiving a first problem report from a first problem tracking tool in a first software development environment among the plurality of software development environments, wherein the first problem report has a first format associated with the first problem tracking tool;

- in response to receiving the first problem report, converting the first problem report into a second format associated with a second problem tracking tool in a second software development environment among the plurality of software development environments using a mapping configured to convert problem reports in the first format into the second format, wherein the mapping is defined in a mapping data structure comprising a plurality of mapping entries, wherein at least one mapping entry includes a wildcarded field, and wherein the first problem report is converted into the second format using the wildcarded field;

- forwarding the converted first problem report in the second format to the second problem tracking tool;

- after forwarding the converted first problem report to the second problem tracking tool, detecting an update made in the first software development environment, wherein the update made in the first software development environment includes a change to the first format;

- dynamically modifying the mapping in response to the detected update;

- receiving a second problem report from the first problem tracking tool, the second problem report formatted in the changed first format;

- in response to receiving the second problem report, converting the second problem report into the second format using the modified mapping; and

- forwarding the converted second problem report in the second format to the second problem tracking tool.

Of note, Applicant has clarified the claim to specify that the mapping occurs between problem reports, as originally recited in claim 2. The claim has also been amended to highlight the result of “dynamically modifying [a] mapping,” namely by reciting the processing of two different problem reports before and after an update has been made to a first software development environment. Prior to the update, a first problem report is converted from a first format to a second format using the mapping. Then, an update is received that changes the first format so that after the update is received, the mapping is dynamically modified so that a second problem report received in the changed first format can still be converted to the second format using the dynamically modified mapping. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, at Figs. 4A-4D and 5A-5B, at pages 12-15 of the Application as originally filed.

Finally, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the mapping includes a wildcarded field, and that the wildcarded field is used in the conversion of a problem report to the second format. Support for this amendment may be found in claims 11 and 33 as originally filed.

Also of note, claims 2-3 and 11 have been canceled for consistency with the amendments made to claim 1.

In rejecting claim 2 (which has been incorporated into claim 1), the Examiner cites Mellen-Garnett, and in particular Figs. 1, 2 and 13 and col. 3, lines 22-67, col.4, lines 36-57, col. 5, lines 2-11, col. 7, lines 23-45 and col. 21, lines 36-67. With respect to Figs. 1-2 and the passages at cols. 3, 4, 5 and 7, however, these passages detail the use of a transformation service to transform data being passed between different applications. It is quite possible that a mapping is used in Mellen-Garnett to perform such data transformation; however, claim 1 is not directed solely to the transformation of data between different formats. Instead, claim 1 is directed to dynamically modifying a mapping so that any transformation that occurs after the dynamic modification uses a different mapping than a transformation that occurs prior to the dynamic modification.

Applicant can find no disclosure in Mellen-Garnett that a mapping or other set of rules that controls how data is transformed by a transformation service can be modified,

and in particular, dynamically modified in response to an update. More specifically with respect to the language in claim 1, there is nothing in Mellen-Garnett that discloses the concept of converting a first problem tracking report from a first format to a second format using a mapping, dynamically modifying the mapping in response to receiving an update that includes a change in the first format, and then converting a second problem tracking report from the changed first format to the second format using the modified mapping.

It should be noted that modifying a mapping is different from modifying a problem tracking report using a mapping. Mellen-Garnett, at the most, discloses modifying data using a mapping, but does not disclose modifying any mapping used to modify data so that the mapping operates differently before and after the mapping is modified.

Also, with respect to the concept of problem tracking tools and reports, the passages in Mellen-Garnett at Fig. 13 and cols. 21, which were cited in connection with claim 2, disclose an error handling service. However, there is nothing in these passages that is related specifically to problem tracking reports, as is recited in claim 1. Furthermore, there is no discussion in the reference of any ability to transform or convert problem tracking reports generated in one environment into a format compatible with another environment. It appears instead that the error handling service in Mellen-Garnett is directed to errors in the environment itself, rather than errors that have been found in software that is being managed by the environment. As discussed at page 2 of the Application, a problem tracking report is describe errors or defects in products, rather than errors or defects in the system itself.

Next, with respect to the concept of using a mapping with a wildcarded field to convert a problem tracking report, the Examiner admits, in connection with the rejection of claim 33, that Mellen-Garnett does not disclose such a concept. Instead, the Examiner relies on Good, col. 5, lines 34-48 for allegedly disclosing this feature. However, Good does not disclose problem tracking reports, nor any type of mapping capable of being used to convert problem tracking reports between different formats. The wildcarded field described in Good, moreover, is used to specify what kind of data will be transferred between multiple application programs, so that an application program can specify to

receive all data from other programs whenever a “template matching key” field is wildcarded. As such, the wildcarded field in Good is used more as a filter than a mapping, as the field is never used to map data between different formats. Claim 1 recites that “the first problem report is converted into the second format using the wildcarded field,” a feature that is neither disclosed nor suggested by Good. As such, even if Good is added to the rejection, the combination of Mellen-Garnett and Good falls short of disclosing or suggesting each and every feature of claim 1.

Applicant therefore respectfully submits that claim 1 is novel and non-obvious over Mellen-Garnett, Good and the other prior art of record. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 1, and of claims 4-10 and 12-15 which depend therefrom, are therefore respectfully requested.

Next with regard to the rejection of independent claim 19, this claim has been amended in a similar manner to claim 1, and includes, in part, the concepts of converting problem tracking reports, converting different problem tracking reports before and after dynamically modifying a mapping, and converting problem tracking reports using a wildcarded field in a mapping. Claims 20-21 and 28 have been canceled for consistency with the amendments made to claim 19. As discussed above in connection with claim 1, this combination of features is not disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 19, and of claims 22-27 and 29-32 which depend therefrom, are therefore respectfully requested.

With regard to the remaining independent claims (claims 16, 33-34 and 37), Applicant has canceled these claims without prejudice to reduce the number of issues before the Examiner. Applicant reserves the right to refile these claims in a future copending application.

As a final matter, Applicant traverses the Examiner’s rejections of the dependent claims based upon their dependency on the aforementioned independent claims. Nonetheless, Applicant notes that a number of these claims recite additional features that further distinguish these claims from the references cited by the Examiner. However, in the interest of prosecutorial economy, these claims will not be addressed separately herein.

In summary, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are novel and non-obvious over the prior art of record. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the foregoing, or which might otherwise further this case onto allowance, the Examiner may contact the undersigned at (513) 241-2324. Moreover, if any other charges or credits are necessary to complete this communication, please apply them to Deposit Account 23-3000.

Respectfully submitted,

July 5, 2007

Date

/Scott A. Stinebruner/

Scott A. Stinebruner

Reg. No. 38,323

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.

2700 Carew Tower

441 Vine Street

Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Telephone: (513) 241-2324

Facsimile: (513) 241-6234